

28044203537

I got involved in a political campaign for the first time in August, 1994. I was brooding about the idea that I would have no one to vote for in the congressional election; the Republicans had a liberal, converted-Democrat running, and the Democrats had a liberal running, and I think of myself as a conservative. I have always been registered as an independent. As I sat in my office thinking about it, Richard Lewis knocked on my door. I asked what I could do for him, and he wanted me to sign his petition to get on the ballot for the race. I asked him what qualified him to run for Congress, and he proceeded to tell me. We talked 3 hours standing in my driveway, and he gave me the answers I needed to hear, so I volunteered to work in program, in addition to signing his petition.

I taught history for 14 years, and I'm rather well acquainted with many major topics...or at least I thought I was. I have a master's degree, and some 26 hours beyond, and I had taught history 14 years. But I will state without question I learned a lot more from Richard than he learned from me. He had been a lobbyist for 18 or 20 years, and he knew about tort reform, health care, insurance, and a number of other subjects, in much greater depth that I could fathom myself. In my opinion, after having worked with him throughout the campaign, he was far more qualified in almost every aspect than the other 2 candidates!

During the campaign, since I had a computer, and I had a good knowledge of the Constitution, I became rather closely involved in the campaign. I knew at the outset that it wouldn't be likely that he would get much notice in the Courier Journal, because I have known it to be a very liberal-oriented paper with little regard for the truth as long as I've lived here, since 1951. I suggested to Richard that we should make an effort to develop a series of position papers which we could print as flyers and distribute them ourselves, with the idea of developing a system of networking which we could use as a direct source ourselves. We wouldn't need to be mentioned in the C-J. I knew it wouldn't be very good to expect much from the newspaper, but I really was not prepared for the blackout we got. The newspaper almost never mentioned Richard's name, and most of the time when they did, what they said was negative. All they ever said about him was that he was a one issue candidate - pro life - which could not have been further from the truth! And I must also say that TV and radio treated him even more shabbily. Even late into the campaign, their anchors still talked as if there were only 2 candidates.

I could write a book about that campaign, but let me keep it brief by mentioning some of the most outstanding flaws in

28044203538

it. To begin with, I didn't know who Dr. Frank Simon was for a long time into the campaign. I had seen a piece his organization had issued comparing the candidates views on some of the early "issues", but I didn't see another piece of the literature he was putting out for the rest of the campaign. I do know he had nothing whatever to do with what we were doing. The pieces we developed I either wrote myself, or typed up in the finished form we were using. Richard wrote a lot of the material, and his brother wrote a couple of pieces, and I wrote most of the rest. At the beginning we put out single sheets on standard 8.5x11 paper. Later on we had two pretty big issues on legal size, one on the front, and another on both sides. We had information on abortion and the 2nd Amendment, of course, but our main thrust was in the area of health care (and the insurance business), the enormity of the debt, the Tenth Amendment, the economy, and the importance of regaining religious freedom, among other things. The Council on Foreign Relations, Trilateralism, and the Establishment took a lot of our time as well. I have to tell you, I had to learn from scratch about them. I had heard a lot of vague things about some mysterious groups before, but I never knew the extent of their control of our government. I've learned a tremendous amount about that in the last year, and it is an extremely important problem that we must deal with in a short length of time.

The campaign started with a debate at the University of Louisville in which Richard was not allowed to participate. We found out from folks on campus the Young Republicans refused to accept him as a viable candidate, even though he was on the ballot. A short time later I learned he would not be allowed to take part in the debate sponsored by the Louisville Chamber of Commerce. Really thrilling, I thought, for my first time in politics, my guy was getting the bum's rush.

At a debate early on at St. Anthony's Hospital, I had occasion to talk with a woman (who turned out to be a lawyer) before the debate who thought Richard to be a one-issue candidate, just in the race to draw votes off from the Republican candidate. After the debate, we talked to her again and she was astounded at how much better Richard had done than the other 2! She was a NOW person, but she actually said she was leaning toward Richard after having heard the debate.

There was another debate at a retirement home on Brooks St. in which Richard was not allowed to appear with the other 2 candidates. Without being able to confirm it, we were told Susan Stokes has refused to appear if Richard was allowed in.

Another debate at the Seelbach Hotel brought many very complimentary remarks from the businessmen who sponsored the debate. Again, they were surprised at the depth of Richard's knowledge of a wide range of subjects.

Still another debate at the Breckenridge Inn, before the underwriters of this area, showed that Richard Lewis had a more

expansive grasp of the role of the insurance business in the proposed health care plan, in which he expressed views that the insurance professionals had not even thought about. Even though he was very tired, he still put both the other candidates in the shade. That was his special area of expertise, because he had been a lobbyist for some time in the state legislature, on the subject of health care reform.

Before an all black audience, the Black Women's Club, I again had occasion to talk with people before and after the debate, and almost without exception they were amazed that Richard had such a grasp on the important issues facing us today. They had their minds made up beforehand, but some gave us an indication we had surprised them.

One of the most important debates of all was one to be held at the Bellarmine College Campus. It was late in the campaign, and WAVE TV was going to televise it. Richard Lewis was not invited to attend and take part! The Jr. Women's League and the local JayCees organization were sponsors, and they simply were not going to invite Richard to take part! We threatened a lawsuit against WAVE TV, and both those organizations, if they refused to let him appear. They relented, and Richard did take part, and he simply blew away the other two candidates. The moderator was Jackie Hayes, an anchor person with WAVE, and she was clearly impressed with how well Richard answered questions. Quite obviously it was against campaign laws for them to leave Richard out. Even so WAVE did not invite him to attend the local morning show with the other two candidates the next morning.

The last debate was broadcast from a location in the Highlands here, and the moderator was Dr. Martie Fox, a local talk show host with radio station WWKY. I was not able to attend that debate, but I am told Martie Fox was so impressed with Richard's performance he awarded him the hat that was supposed to be symbolic of the victor.

(There were some other debates but these were the ones I remember best.)

I was with Richard when he took part in a talk show on WHAS night time with Joe Elliot. Joe is an avowed liberal. He had even told me when I was making arrangements for the appearance, that his audience would not be sympathetic to Richard, and he would be wasting his time. That night, callers were so positive for Richard, Joe invited him to stay an extra hour! And yet he deliberately left him out of another show with the other 2 candidates on for the whole evening! Joe made the remark on the air that Richard did not stand a snowball's chance of winning; why was he running?

Another radio interview with Stu Williams on WWKY had Williams making the remark during the show that Susan Stokes, the next 3rd district representative, was going to win; why was he running?

28044203540

I must tell you, I was positively astounded that the local media downplayed Richard's role in the election in such an unvarnished biased way throughout the whole campaign! I believed that our system could handle the threat of a well-qualified third party candidate without using such flagrant tactics to squelch what he had to say to the public! I expected little overt support from them, but I never expected quite the whitewash job they did on Richard. I learned that the "American way" only works if you have hundreds of thousands of dollars to support your campaign, wherever those dollars may come from. A Kentucky election should be an expression of the will of Kentucky voters, not the vested moneyed interests of wealthy people in New York, Illinois, and California! Both the other candidates had more than a half million each, mostly from those moneyed people from other states who had a vested interest in seeing a Democrat or Republican win.

We distributed our issue papers at four major industrial plants in the area. I was at three of them, and I was impressed that people didn't just throw our material away. They read our material. One place, there were even calls to our office from the supervisors of the plant how they noticed that our material was not throw away. None of it showed up on the grounds, or the floor of the plant, but a lot of it was posted on bulletin boards, and lockers.

I know we must have made a heavy impact because at the end of the campaign, the other 2 candidates were bending over backwards to appear more conservative in their views. They must have made panic calls to their parties because they had a very heavy influx of big money right at the end of the campaign. And the media had ignored us completely until the last week, when three TV stations insisted on having interviews. They were covering their collective behinds, if the truth be known! One Courier Journal reporter came to interview Richard in the last week, a guy named Mike Quinlan, and I stood there and listened to the interview. What he put in the newspaper was not even faintly like what the interview was like. As an instance, he asked Richard, since he supported the 2nd amendment, did he have any guns. Richard told him he had a World War II rifle, an M-1. I distinctly remembered hearing that segment of the interview. Quinlan wrote Richard had a World War II machine gun at his home! He either told a deliberate lie, or he is not competent to write for a major newspaper! Anything to discredit Richard at the last minute!

During the course of the campaign, we discovered through our sources that both Gingrich and Dole, on the 20th of September, 1994, had made a deal with Clinton to put off Clinton's health care plan for a year in exchange for their support of the G.A.T.T. You may recall, the G.A.T.T. was voted on by a

28044203541

lame-duck Congress in which at least 92 of the membership knew they would not be back. It happens that I am an inveterate viewer of C-Span, and I had seen Senator Hollings' committee meeting on the G.A.T.T. in which, among other things, a law professor from Harvard had expressed his opinion that the treaty was unconstitutional. That also was the day when Ralph Nader appeared before the committee in opposition, and he read from the enabling legislation booklet the things he found wrong with the treaty. A woman had presented the case for G.A.T.T. as the representative of the A.B.A., AND NADER TOOK HER TESTIMONY APART BY THE NUMBERS! I made copious notes and I was better prepared to vote on G.A.T.T. than our 2 senators were (!), and anyone else who voted for it. I made an outline for Richard to use and we also worked up a position on that so-called treaty. I still think I have a better knowledge of that travesty than any of the members of Congress who voted for it. To begin with, the treaty itself is more than 27,000 pages long! Who really read it at all? The enabling legislation booklet was 1,400 pages long, and very few even read that! (Hank Brown and Ralph Nader had a bet on it. Brown actually read it to bone up for a quiz by Nader, and he announced publicly that he had been for it...until he read it! And he voted against it. We had better information in our paper than either of the other 2. And we knew about the "deal", and they didn't! And we knew it a whole month before it happened!)

Single issue candidate, was he? I don't think so.

I was very close to the campaign. On more than 1 occasion, in talking about whether or not that one Simon piece at the beginning had had any effect on the campaign, Richard had told me and his brother privately that he wished he (Simon) hadn't put the piece out in the first place. It hurt us! Richard said all it did was make people think he was a single issue candidate, and give credence to the story the Courier Journal was trying to sell to the public, that Richard was only in the race to take votes away from Stokes. I know he wasn't happy with the Simon piece. I also know that in a talk-show interview with Jane Norris, a caller, who was an obvious plant, accused Richard of being in league with Simon and said she had been handed a Simon piece by Richard which she was embarrassed for her 8 year old daughter to see. Before it was over, Richard caused the woman to admit she had gotten the piece in the mail, and Richard had nothing to do with handing it to her. She had deliberately LIED, for no other reason than to make him look bad to the radio audience. Richard told her on the air she was not telling the truth by saying he had handed her a Simon piece, and that she could get into serious trouble by accusing him of breaking a federal law on the air! She immediately changed her story. This was so obviously a Stokes supporter...but we have no proof, so we can only relate the

story.

If there is any question about the way that campaign was carried out, there ought to be serious inquiry into the way a viable candidate for the Congress of the United States was shut out of any positive news coverage by all major media outlets! There might even be room for question as to how a Young Republican campus group managed to not even invite a viable candidate to take part in a campus debate. Most certainly the question popped into my mind that the Louisville Chamber of Commerce was negligent in not allowing Richard Lewis to take part in their sponsored debate. I understand that private groups who sponsor a debate are not required to invite all candidates, but the Chamber of Commerce is supposedly a representative body of our city! I think that stinks!

I can be certain that none of the material we published came from other sources, because I know where it came from; I typed most of the material we used myself, whether I wrote it or not. I know Richard's brother also had a computer late in the campaign, and his computer was used in the preparation of the 11x14 issues we had, but I edited all of it. Neither of them can spell too well, and I can. So far as I know, and I remind you I never saw any of his material except the first piece, Dr. Simon's material was limited to comparing the positions of the candidates on abortion and homosexuality. We were against both, but that became minor information compared to what we developed in our papers. We hardly mentioned right to life or anti-abortion themes after we got a head of steam.

We started out like a disorganized mob, but before the campaign ended, the people working in our campaign were doing really well. We had our own people, and they did a remarkable job down the stretch. I know the night of the election, I was with Richard and his brother before our party, and we were making plans about the transition to Washington. We thought we had a good chance of winning the election! Our response from people we talked to had been so good, and at the end of the campaign we were getting such positive comments from people we talked to that we really thought we would be winners, or at least second. Dr. Simon did not even enter our minds. He had no positive effect on our campaign, and I don't really think he cared a hoot; he was only interested in putting out information against homosexuality, and against abortion.

My understanding of the laws in Kentucky is that in order for a person registered as either a Democrat or Republican to run as an independent, he has to change his registration before the general election at least a year in advance of the time he wants to run. The contention that Frank Simon picked Richard Lewis to run after the primaries last year is ludicrous. It's

28044203543

against the law in Kentucky. For Richard to have even gotten a petition to get on the ballot in August, 1994, to run as an independent, he had to have changed his registration by at least September, 1993. It is less than intelligent to even consider the scenario of Simon having schemed with Lewis after the primaries of 1994, just to draw votes from Susan Stokes. Aside from other considerations, Richard is his own man. He would not even have considered such a plan. To continue to raise questions about the subject is nothing less than harassment. There is no point to it.

The piece that Dr. Simon put out early in the campaign, the only one of his things with which I am familiar, did not make any endorsement of a candidate; it only listed them with a comparison of their positions on those subjects, listing Richard Lewis first. If that is an endorsement, you might want to look at the "endorsement" Mike Ward got from a Christian group later in the campaign. There was a forum held at a Christian church in which all candidates running for office in this district were invited to attend. Mike Ward was the only one who did not show up! Yet, when a similar piece to that of Dr. Simon was published by a Christian organization as a result of that forum, no endorsement was made, but Mike Ward was the first one listed. Are you pursuing the possibility of there having been some plot to have him endorsed by that Christian group, because he was not even at the forum, yet he was listed first? I was personally astounded that he was listed first, because he is pro-abortion and pro-gay rights! And everyone knew it!

Robert C. Wallace.

Louisville, Ky. 40205

GATT seen as spawning '96 third-party challenge

David R. Sands
WASHINGTON TIMES

GATT opponents yesterday said Clinton's ardent support for the trade deal virtually guarantees a third-party presidential challenge in 1996.

Economist Pat Choate, co-author with Ross Perot of a book titled "The Case for a Third Party," would discuss the third-party idea in a radio address to listeners tomorrow night.

"I think there will be a Gene McCarthy challenge to Clinton in '96," Choate said, adding that the Minnesota liberal lost early primary successes in 1988 led President Johnson to withdraw from the race.

"And there will definitely be a

United We Stand third party, about which Mr. Perot will have more to say Sunday evening," he added, referring to the political organization Mr. Perot founded in his 1992 independent presidential bid.

The Rev. Jesse Jackson, another GATT foe, said yesterday it was "premature" to discuss a presidential bid in 1996.

But Mr. Jackson, who ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984 and 1988, added: "It is not premature to begin the building of a state-by-state infrastructure to restore hope across the country."

GATT opponents yesterday were still reeling from overwhelming votes in the House Tuesday and the Senate Thursday approving the pact, which was

signed by more than 120 nations in April to create a World Trade Organization (WTO) under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Treaty supporters, with Mr. Clinton as the chief cheerleader, said the deal would open foreign markets to U.S. goods, create jobs and raise incomes at home, plus ensure U.S. economic leadership abroad.

Critics said the agreement would cost jobs and create an international bureaucracy that could undermine U.S. health, safety and environmental laws.

An unlikely coalition featuring consumer activist Ralph Nader and conservative columnist Pat Buchanan, and ideological opposites like Sen. Jesse Helms, North

Carolina Republican, and Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio Democrat, waged a loud but losing battle against the massive trade deal.

The measure passed both houses of Congress with strong bipartisan backing. The Senate also approved a controversial waiver of federal budget laws to pass GATT, which would lower the government's revenues by cutting tariffs on a range of consumer and industrial goods.

Mr. Perot's United We Stand aimed criticism at the waiver vote. Then senators who signed a July 15 letter pledging to oppose the waiver — including Republicans John W. Warner of Virginia, Robert F. Bennett of Utah and newly elected Majority Whip Trent Lott

of Mississippi — voted for the waiver on Thursday.

"GATT will become the greatest political boomerang ever," predicted Lori Wallach, director of the trade program at the Nader-founded lobbying group Public Citizen.

Many senators noted that phone calls to their offices on GATT before the vote were overwhelmingly negative, and critics such as Mr. Nader said a national referendum would have meant overwhelming rejection of the treaty.

William Bywater, president of the International Union of Electronic Workers and a fierce critic of GATT and last year's North American Free Trade Agreement, said he would not support Mr. Clinton because of the GATT fight.

Emphasizing he was not speaking for the AFL-CIO, his union's parent organization, Mr. Bywater said, "After what he did on those two agreements, how can I go to my people and support him?"

Mr. Bywater said he was open to the idea of a third party to run candidates in certain states, noting that the Conservative Party had provided the margin of victory in Republican challenger George E. Pataki's bid to unseat longtime New York Gov. Mario Cuomo last month.

GATT foes plan to keep the trade deal in the public spotlight, publicizing WTO decisions against the United States and launching a campaign to have the United States withdraw from the Geneva-based organization by 1997.

NATION

Both GOP, Democrats quietly fight to foil 3rd party

By Scott Shepard
OCT. NEWS SERVICE

The Democratic and Republican parties are responding to the American public's growing appetite for a third political party with quiet attempts to keep third parties and independents off state ballots.

"It's pretty depressing after years of improvement," said Richard Winger, who heads the Coalition for Free and Open Elections, which monitors legal requirements for third parties and independent candidates.

Mr. Winger's passion is ballot access, a rather dry and mundane endeavor compared with all the hoopla of political campaigns, but far more important than any polling group, stump speech or at-

nack ad.

Now that Americans want more choices when they go into the voting booth, the Republicans and Democrats are working overtime to limit access to ballots and thereby hold on to their political monopoly.

• In New Hampshire, Republican state legislators are trying to remove the Libertarian Party from the 1996 presidential primary ballot.

• In Alabama, Democrats are trying to increase the number of signatures third-party candidates need to get on the ballot and limit the time they have to gather signatures.

• In Illinois, both parties are trying to prohibit third-party and independent candidates from paying petition gatherers by the sig-

nature.

• In Maryland, both parties defeated a bill to lower the number of signatures needed by a third party or independents to get on the ballot.

• And while gubernatorial races thwarted them, state legislators in Georgia and Arizona tried recently to shorten petition periods and to require third parties to register a percentage of voters to remain on the ballot.

"I guess both parties are feeling a little insecure," Mr. Winger said.

And for good reason. Last summer, a poll by the Times Mirror Center for People and the Press got a lot of attention with its finding that 53 percent of Americans wanted a third political party, a jump of nearly 10 percent since 1982.

What has gotten less attention is that last month the Times Mirror Center found the figure has grown to 57 percent.

"The American people are no longer committed to a two-party system," said David Gillespie, author of "Politics at the Periphery: Third Parties in Two-Party America."

With that weakening commitment to a two-party system comes a much higher caliber of third-party and independent candidates, both at the presidential and state level.

Last fall, for example, 16 of the 20 Senate contests and nearly half of 146 competitive House races included independent or third-party candidates — more than in any midterm election since the 1960s. In gubernatorial races last fall,

independent Angus King won in Maine; Green candidate Roberto Mondragon got 10.4 percent in New Mexico, enough to earn the Greens status as a "major party"; independent Wes Watkins got 23.5 percent in Oklahoma, and anti-abortion activist Peg Lintick got 12.7 percent in Pennsylvania.

The major national parties "stand at a kind of disreputable party," said Stanley Greenberg, who has been the chief pollster for the Clinton White House. Consequently, voters feel "doubly betrayed."

Despite all the obstacles to forming a national third party, however, Ross Perot's loyalists are forging ahead even as their leader poisons his future. In California, United We Stand America volunteers already have held 15 meet-

ings to discuss how to form a third party.

Likewise, the Rev. Jesse Jackson has been sounding out confidants on his presidential prospects for either a Democratic primary challenge to President Clinton, an independent candidacy or a third party.

"All options are open," Mr. Jackson said.

And, of course, Colin Powell, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, keeps dropping hints that he would like to see a third party emerge in U.S. politics.

"It might be interesting to have an independent party in 1996 to throw some more fun into the game," Mr. Powell said recently, adding, "I checked the Constitution — you don't have to belong to a party."

COMMENTARY

TONY SNOW

On the eve of the most fascinating national election in decades, an overwhelming question looms: Are our major political parties as stupid as they appear?

Democrats have let Bill Clinton define them as New Deal dinosaurs, while Republicans sound like Ronald Reagan mumbling in his sleep. Neither seems able to provide what Americans want — a party willing to flatten the establishment and help average people assume a larger role in governing the country.

Politicians rank lower in public esteem than even members of the media. More than 50 percent of the electorate would like to see an alternative to the Democrats and Republicans, and 30 percent would join a rebel outfit today — making the Party to be Named Later second only to the Democrats.

David Gillespie, a political scientist and author of "Politics at the Periphery: Third Parties in Two-Party America," says, "There is more construction of new parties now than at any time since the end

of World War II, and probably since the Great Depression." Today, 19 parties run candidates in general elections, and by 1996, at least four — Democrat, Republican, Libertarian and Patriot/Independence — could appear on ballots in at least half the states.

Statewide organizations also have blossomed, especially where voters can place issues directly on the ballot through initiative, referendum or recall. In a sign that angry citizens have identified common themes, nearly a dozen states will consider tax-limitation initiatives this year, while many others will review proposals to protect property rights and limit congressional terms.

Ross Perot can claim some credit for this constructive chaos. His candidacy exposed the dry rot within the major parties and inspired people to action. He may have fomented a further revolt by rec-

Two-party time bomb at political center

More than 50 percent of the electorate would like to see an alternative and 30 percent would join a rebel outfit today — making the Party to be Named Later second only to the Democrats.

commending last week that voters "give the Republicans a majority in the House and the Senate and say, 'All right, now, we're going to let you guys have a turn at bat.'"

Republican majorities in one or both houses, it also will generate pressure for a Republican Congress to slip its reform program past a Democratic president — an unlikely prospect.

Vin Weber, a political maven and former Republican congressman, thinks Mr. Perot has "set himself up to turn Americans against both parties and set up an alternative party. He can say, 'We've given them both a chance, and they haven't done the job.'"

Another GOP strategist agrees: "Perot's announcement will give us a Republican Congress," the official says. "But there's also a 50-50 chance of a major third party within two years." In other words, the party of Lincoln could enjoy its biggest parliamentary victory since Reconstruction this year — only to disintegrate by the turn of the century.

In any event, the question is not whether a new party will appear, but how. There are two possibilities: It can make a big fuss, force the establishment to adopt its agenda and then vanish — like Teddy Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party — or hasten the death of a foundering party and rush in to fill the vacuum, like the Republican Party in the 1850s.

Either way, a new party must do several things if it hopes to survive. First, it must run a national ticket. Many places will not permit parties to put up candidates for statewide election until they have proven their strength by garnering a legally prescribed percentage of the state's vote in a presidential contest.

Next, it will need a strong leader — a requirement that explains the excitement about would-be messiahs Ross Perot and Colin Powell.

Finally, and most importantly, it must develop an organizing principle. When Abraham Lincoln was shopping for a political home in the

mid-1850s, he wrote a friend: "I have no objection to 'fuss' with any body provided I can fuse on ground which I think is right... Last summer, I advised those who did me the honor of a hearing to 'stand with any body who stands right.'"

The major parties can't easily satisfy this criterion because a proper message could spell their doom. The tide of American discontent rises not from fringe voters but from the political center, where average Americans want to tear apart a system now dominated by lobbyists and one-deal/legislators. Republicans and Democrats can't just tipoe their way around these raging moderates. They have to accept the mega-reform challenge. The future belongs to whoever first captures the public mood best expressed by the Republican staffer who issued this bumper-sticker-length call to arms:

"It's my money, stupid, and my life. Get out of it."

Tony Snow is a Washington-based editorial page columnist for the Detroit News and is nationally syndicated.

Most Americans do not understand how private third world loans made by America's largest commercial banks have co-opted control over our nations fiscal & monetary policy. Permissive refinancing (rescheduling of loan payments) overseen by congress and the Fed for over a decade has resulted in third world debt so large that defaults now threaten our entire banking system.[9] pgs.100,131-145 See time magazine 3/30/95, Business Week magazine 3/20/95 N.Y Times 2/9/95 & 3/12/95 Washington Times 2/2/95 See time magazine 3/30/95.

In 1964 there were ten U.S. Banks operating outside the United States their combined assets equaled \$6 Billion dollars.[14] pg.76-77

1975 Bank of America, Chase Manhattan & First National City Bank of New York, made almost 60% of their loans & earnings overseas in foreign currencies. [13] pg.135

By 1978 130 U.S. banks operating overseas had assets totaling \$150 billion dollars. [14] pg.76-77

In 1982 in a meeting at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mexico's finance minister warned bankers that unless Mexico got a lot more money (new bank loans) Mexico would have to default. Bankers were afraid a Mexican default would result in a run on exposed banks! They feared a resulting liquidity crisis would force interest rates high enough to create a depression. The federal reserve cut a deal with New York bankers & the IMF to provide Mexico \$8.3 billion. [9] pg.14

In 1984 our nine largest commercial banks had more than 100% their outstanding equity in third world loans. Citibank 135%, Bank America 158%, Chase Manhattan 162%, Manufacturers Hanover 193%, Morgan Guaranty 139%, Chemical Bank 141%, Bankers Trust 162%, First Chicago 128%, formerly Continental Illinois. [8] pg.135 What are the current percentages of American commercial bank investments in third world loans? If these percentages are lower how was that accomplished? Have any of these countries paid off their debts?

In 1985 an FDIC study showed our nations 15 largest banks had accumulated \$1 Trillion in liabilities not shown on the books [8] pg.142 What were those liabilities? Were they third world loans? How large are current liabilities not shown on the books? Why does the FDIC & congress allow these practices?
Pg.7

In 1985 Mexico declared it would be unable to repay interest due on loans. Recession in Brazil, Peru & other less developed country's threatened more defaults. Treasury Secretary James Baker developed a plan that required banks in the U.S. & overseas to provide \$20 billion to stop third world loan defaults.[8] pg.136

In 1987 Brazil could not make interest payments on its \$110 billion dollar debt. American banks loaned Brazil another \$4.5 billion dollars in order to avoid a default. [9] pg.101 What is Brazil's current debt to American private banks?

In 1987 all twelve of Americas money market banks got almost 50% of their deposits from overseas. These investments are generally larger than \$100,000 dollars and are not protected by F.D.I.C. Overnight deposit interest competition among nations & the potential of huge withdrawals makes this kind of banking risky [9] pg.129 What is the percentage of foreign deposits in our banks in 1995?

According to a June 20,1994 issue of Forbes magazine foreign investors own \$2.5 trillion in American assets. That article explains how rapidly the dollar could devalue if only 10% of those holdings were reallocated to other currencies.

In 1994 congress gave some consideration to Senate bill 2158 (a proposal for a dual dollar). A study done around 1984 indicated American banks could survive third world loan defaults only by isolating international & domestic finance. [8] pg.135

In 1995 Mexico was again unable to meet its interest obligations President Clinton loaned/gave Mexico \$20 billion dollars.House speaker Newt Gingrich & Senate leader Bob Dole did not allow any challenges or debates. WHY?

What is the total debt owed to American banks by Mexico,Peru, Argentina, Venezuela,the Philippines & other(third world countries) in 1995? How many times and in what amounts have new loans been provided to these countries to reschedule loans & avoid defaults?
[8] Beyond Our Means by Alfred L. Malabre Jr. c.1987 [9] Whats Next by Paul Erdman c.1987 [13] How To Prosper During the Coming Bad Years by Howard J.Ruff c.1979 [14] Crisis Investing by Douglas R.Casey c.1979 (for research only -Richard Lewis)
Pg.8

Americans Should Demand

When America was on a gold standard it was not difficult for Americans to determine the strength of the dollar. The dollar had a fixed and recoverable value in gold. The size of the Gold reserve was a matter of public record and that gold reserve could be compared to national debt. That comparison indicated the nations (liquidity) its financial strength.

Leaving the gold standard brought on many changes:

"The money will be worth one hundred cents on the dollar, because it is backed by the credit of the nation. It will represent a mortgage on all the homes and other property of all the people of the nation" (congressional record of the House March 9, 1933 Pg. 83).

"As a result of this, the ultimate ownership of all property is in the state; individual so called 'ownership' is only by virtue of government, i.e. law 'owner' amounting to mere user, and the use must be in accordance with the law and subordinate to the necessities of the state." (senate document # 43 1933)

The statement above should emphasize the importance of our nations net worth. Perhaps your congressman and news media deserve some thoughtful letters! America's debt & (undervalued gold policy) was ultimately responsible for ending the gold exchange standard we did not have enough (undervalued) gold to back our debt!

Because America's Money and it's debt is now backed by a mortgage on all the nations assets we can not evaluate the debt without comparing the debt to our net worth!

Anyone who holds (owns) stock in an American corporation is entitled (by force of law S.E.C. regulations) to receive a report of that corporations net worth, income & debt obligations. This provides the investor information necessary to evaluate the strength of that investment.

Does our National Debt represent a small or large percentage of our nations net worth?

Pg.9

Information provided by Richard Lewis 1-502-454-3707 for research only!

875E0277082

A Net worth Statement

Congress cannot fulfill its constitutional responsibility to coin or regulate the value of our money unless they know our nations net worth! Citizens cannot comprehend the debt in terms of our nations (liquidity) its financial strength without a yearly net worth statement.

Our debt is a political tool! It is used to shape our thinking, define our expectations and justify high taxes but the stockholders of this nation lack information necessary to evaluate that debt. If the debt is huge in relation to our net worth we may be in worse shape than we understand on the other hand if the debt is actually small in terms of our net worth we are being manipulated for political purposes!

"A disordered currency is one of the greatest political evils. It undermines the virtues necessary for the support of the social system, and encourages propensities destructive to its happiness. It wars against industry frugality and economy, and it fosters evil spirits of extravagance and speculation. Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money (congressional record, March 4, 1846) statement of Daniel Webster

It is well enough that the people of the nation do not understand our banking and monetary system, for if they did, I believe there would be a revolution before tomorrow morning. (Henry Ford)

In 1979 Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal held hearings, he had become alarmed by the size of Arabic investments in our national debt and by the huge amounts they were investing in our banks (banks that were the largest domestic purchasers of our nations debt instruments). When the Congressman asked the Treasury about the actual size of Arabic investments the Treasury refused to provide that information. (information source: Paul Erdmans Money Book by Paul Erdman Random House C 1984 Pg. 75)

We once paid our debts in silver or gold. Now our debt represents a mortgage untold. Is it now a secret that must unfold how much of our Nation do we still hold ??? (Richard Lewis May 6, 1995)

Pg.10

Information provided by Richard Lewis 1-502-454-3707 for research only!

SECURE 90

U. S. SENATE
Election 1990



Mitch McConnell
Republican

KENTUCKY
ISSUES



Harvey Sloane
Democrat

SUPPORTS	Balanced Budget Amendment	OPPOSES
SUPPORTS	Pledge Not to Raise Taxes	OPPOSES
SUPPORTS	Voluntary Prayer in Public Schools	OPPOSES
OPPOSES	Minority Status for Homosexuals	UNDECIDED
SUPPORTS	SDI (Defense Against Nuclear Attacks)	OPPOSES
PRO-LIFE	Abortion	PRO-CHOICE
SUPPORTS	Use of Force in Iraq	OPPOSES
SUPPORTS	Parental Choice in Education, Tax Credits	OPPOSES

For more information, write:
American Freedom Coalition of Kentucky
1424 Falcon Drive
Louisville, KY 40213

There are inherent limitations in judging the qualifications of an incumbent or challenger on the basis of certain selected issues. Consideration should be given to unrecorded matters such as personality, character, and conduct in a wider